

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOUIS ACOSTA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION,
et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:20-cv-01209-DAD-EPG (PC)

ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
CLARIFICATION

(ECF No. 46)

Louis Acosta ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action.

On November 8, 2021, Plaintiff filed what the Court construes as a motion for clarification. (ECF No. 46). Plaintiff states that he never received Defendants' response to the Court's Order Regarding Early Settlement Conference (ECF No. 35). Plaintiff states that he has gathered the documents listed in Order and asks what he is supposed to do with those documents. Plaintiff also asks what steps he needs to take to move this case forward.

Plaintiff did not receive Defendants' response to the Order Regarding Early Settlement Conference because Defendants did not opt out. As mentioned in the Order, "[i]f the assigned Deputy Attorney General does not opt out of the settlement conference, the Court will issue an order setting a settlement conference." (*Id.* at 2). An order setting a settlement conference will be issued in due course. At that same time, or soon thereafter, the Court will also provide the parties with the procedures required by the settlement judge.

As to the documents Plaintiff gathered, Plaintiff shall provide those documents to defense

1 counsel “no later than fourteen days after the date of service of the order setting the settlement
2 conference.” (Id.). If the case does not settle at the settlement conference, the Court will issue a
3 scheduling order.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: November 10, 2021

/s/ Eric P. Gray
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28